

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,717	03/26/2004	Hans-Ove Hagelin	19378.0084	8088
Edward A. Pen	7590 12/11/2007 nington		EXAM	INER
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP			HOLMES, MICHAEL B	
Suite 300 3000 K Street, NW.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20007-5116			2121	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/809,717	HAGELIN, HANS-OVE			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Michael B. Holmes	2121			
	- The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	<u> </u>			
Period fo	• •					
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS INSTRUCTION OF A STATE O	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		·				
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 O</u>	<u>ctober 2007</u> .				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.	. •				
,—	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)[5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 13</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	•			
Applicat	ion Papers		•			
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	:Г.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the International Bureau	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* t	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	S. W. M. C.			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) 🔲 Info	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal (6) Other:				

10/809,717 Art Unit: 2121



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 - www.uspto.gov

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

- 1. This Office Action is responsive to communication received on 06/26/2007.
- 2. Claims 1-11 & 13 have been examined.
- 3. Claim 12 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

- 4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:
 - Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
- 5. The invention as disclosed in claims 1-11 & 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being non-statutory subject matter. see In re Comiskey, Case No. 2006-1286, at 8, 16-21, (Fed. Cir., September 20, 2007). "Only if the requirements of § 101 are satisfied is the inventor allowed to pass through to the other requirements for patentability, such as novelty under § 102 and, non-obviousness under § 103." "Moreover, ... when an abstract concept has no claimed practical application, it is not patentable."
- 6. No preemption is permitted i.e., when a claim is so broad that it reads on both statutory and nonstatutory subject matter, it must be amended. A claim that recites a computer that solely

10/809,717 Art Unit: 2121

calculates a mathematical formula is not statutory. In other words, one may not patent a process that comprises every "substantial practical application" of an abstract idea, because such a patent in "practical effect would be a patent on the [abstract idea] itself." Regarding claims 1-19 i.e., "a method of establishing rules for a device used for generating decision support for user decision," would in fact cover virtually any form of device employing rules for decision support. Nothing is specified in the claims to limit the invention to a particular application e.g., an aircraft targeting system, a submarine attack system, a land-based vehicle guided missile system, a computer network security system, intelligence system, a money management system, an electronic product management system, a content management system, a customer relationship management system, or an intellectual property management system. Without clearly stating in the claim a particular application, it preempts any form of relationship between a plurality of existing rules in a rule set. Where as, the courts have also held that a claim may not preempt ideas, laws of nature or natural phenomena. The concern over preemption was expressed as early as 1852. See Le Roy v. Tatham, 55 U.S. (14 How.) 156, 175 (1852) ("A principle, in the abstract, is a fundamental truth; an original cause; a motive; these cannot be patented, as no one can claim in either of them an exclusive right."); See Funk Bros. Seed Co.v. Kalo Inoculant Co., 333 U.S.127, 132, 76 USPQ 280, 282 (1948).

Correspondence Information

7. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael B. Holmes, who may be reached Monday through

Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at (571) 272-3686 or facsimile transmission (571) 273-3686 or email michael.holmesb@uspto.gov.

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (571) 273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the Examiner's Supervisor, David .

Vincent, may be reached at (571) 272-3080.

Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist @ (Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22313), located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building.

Finally, information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Moreover, status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) toll-free @ 1-866-217-9197.

Michael B. Holmes

Patent Examiner
Artificial Intelligence
Art Unit 2121

United States Department of Commerce Patent & Trademark Office

Monday, December 03, 2007

MBH